

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/700,475	01/11/2001	Timothy D. Evans	PQC-199US	5504
23122	7590 10/16/2002			
RATNERPI			EXAMINER	
P O BOX 980 VALLEY FO	RGE, PA 19482-0980		ALVO, MARC S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1731	11
			DATE MAILED: 10/16/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•		mx-1)			
•	, Application No.	Applicant(s)	, , ,			
Advisory Action	09/700,475	EVANS ET AL.				
, Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Steve Alvo	1731				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	p ars on th cov r sheet w	ith the correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 01 October 2002 FAILS TO PLACE IN FAILS TO PLACE IN FAILS TO PLACE IN THE PLACE	o avoid abandonment of th : (1) a timely filed amendn peal (with appeal fee); or (is application. A proper re ent which places the appli	pry to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR I	REPLY [check either a) or	b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext 67 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorter b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set r than SIX MONTHS from the main AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH date on which the petition under 3 tension and the corresponding amed statutory period for reply origin	ling date of the final rejection. IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. OF CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate out of the fee. The appropriate expally set in the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a))	nt's Brief must be filed wit CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dis	hin the period set forth in smissal of the appeal.				
2.☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cand NOTE:	celing a corresponding nui	mber of finally rejected clai	ms.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	jection(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) woo canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	uld be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely file	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because:	for reconsideration has be <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	een considered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed \$	SOLELY to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims	ent(s) a) will not be enter would be rejected is prov	ered or b) will be entered ided below or appended.	and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	ws:					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is a)	disapproved by the Exar	miner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure States	ment(s)(PTO-1449) Pape	r No(s)/ \///				
10.		Steve Alvo Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1731				

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 09/700,475

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: A comparison has not been made to the 1:16 of Siminoski which is very close to the claimed 1:15 ratio. Also is not enough information is provided in the Declaration. The Declaration of Dr. Raymond C. Francis states that there was an internal communication that was not intended to be publically disclosed. However, it was not stated whether or not National Silicates Ltd. agreed to keep the report confidential. It is not clear who had access to the communication. It is not clear as to what was the relationship between Dr. Francis and National Silicates Ltd. Dr. Francis states that the subject matter was first published in January 1998. Who were the authors of the article? Such publication should be submitted to the Patent Office for consideration.